UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/388,351	09/01/1999	ERIK J. SNAPPER	03797.77746	3809

28319   7590   07/16/2003

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET , N.W.
ELEVENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER
BIENEMAN, CHARLES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 June 2003_ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _3-28 and 31-55_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _3-28 and 31-55_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _19 June 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment and Terminal ᗪisclaimer

filed on June 16, 2003.

2.   Claims 3-28 and 31-55 are pending. Claims 3-6, 9, 11-16, 21, 31-33, 36, 38-46, 52, and

54 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

4.   **Claims 3-4, 6-7, 9-15, 21-22, 24, 26-28, 31, 33-34, 36-44, 46-47, and 50-54** are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,794,259 to <u>Kikinis</u>,

issued August 11, 1998, in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,192,380 B1 to <u>Light et al.</u>, issued

February 29, 2001, filed March 31, 1998.

Regarding **independent claim 3**, <u>Kikinis</u> discloses (1) displaying on a computer screen a

form comprising a plurality of fields, each field having a field identifier and a data entry region

into which a data value can be written. (<u>Kikinis</u>, Figs. 1, 2.)

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> discloses (2) determining that a user has selected one of the plurality of

fields. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 4, lines 15-20: "It will be apparent to those with skill in the art that there

are a variety of ways the bubble feature may be activated. For example, the code could be

provided so one may move the conventional screen cursor to a field and provide the activating

signal by a hot key, displaying the bubble."; col. 4, lines 29-31: "In an alternative embodiment

the bubble may be invoked at the first use of the control code, and used with the "Normal Fill"

selection to fill fields one at a time.")

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> discloses (3) comparing the field identifier of the selected field to previously stored field identifiers and, upon finding a match, displaying a list of suggested data values previously stored in response to one or more different forms previously filled in by the user. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 3, lines 66-67: "The code executing matches field names in the form with tags to the prestored information about the user . . ."; col. 4, lines 7-10: "a preferred embodiment another Hot Key or key combination, or key and mouse button combination causes the control code executing to display a bubble 210 having a selection list 212 of tags for prestored information.")

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> discloses (4) in response to the user selecting one of the suggested data values, copying the selected one data value into the data entry region of the selected field. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 4, lines 22-25: "Any one of a variety of mechanisms might be incorporated for selection of a highlighted item in the list, which then is inserted into the field to which the bubble points.")

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> does not disclose (5) in response to the user entering a non-suggested data value, storing the non-suggested data value into a data storage area for future use. However, <u>Light et al.</u> teaches adding to a database a form field identifier and the data entered in the form either automatically or in response to a user query when that information was not previously found in the database. (<u>Light et al.</u>, col. 7. lines 11-19.) Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement such a step because it would have clearly increased the efficiency of filling out the form to have field values remembered the next time the user encountered the form, and because the field identifier would have assisted in locating the data the next time it was needed, and the data value entered in the form would have been needed to fill

out the form the next time it was presented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to have extended Kikinis to implement step (5).

Further, Kikinis inherently discloses prior to step (4) detecting a user-initiated action and

inhibiting copying of the suggested data value into the data entry region until after receipt of the

user-initiated action inasmuch as Kikinis teaches copying the suggested data value into the data

entry region upon detecting a user-initiated action as discussed above regarding step (4) and such

copying would not have taken place, i.e., would have been inhibited, until after receipt of the

user-initiated action.

Regarding **independent claim 4**, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated

herein.

Further, Kikinis teaches step (1) comprising displaying a web page using an Internet web

browser and that step (3) is preformed in the Internet Web browser. (Kikinis, col. 3, lines 47-53:

"In an embodiment of the present invention, control code is provided to automatically fill in such

forms when user activated. The control code may be a terminate-and-stay-resident (TSR)

program, for example, or a plug-in module to a WEB browser application. In a preferred

embodiment the control code of the invention is a plug-in to a WEB browser.")

Regarding **independent claim 6**, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated

herein.

Further, Kikinis does not teach step (3) comprising the step of comparing the field

identifier of the selected field to a first plurality of dynamically updated historical identifiers and

also to a second plurality of statically created identifiers and displaying suggested data values

taken from both sources. However, Light et al. teach storing identifiers from both sources.

(Light et al., col. 4, lines 32-36: "Generally, the user will wish to initially enter the personal information to be filled into the various forms. Alternatively, this step may be skipped, and the system may only learn from user input, as will be described below."; *see also* col. 7, lines 11-19.) One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that using identifiers both from a statically created profile and extracted from various web sited would have conferred the benefit of providing the greatest likelihood that one of the suggested data values would in fact be the data value that the user wished to insert into the form. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the steps recited.

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Kikinis teaches comparing the field identifier of the selected field to a statically created common names data store comprising frequently used field identifiers that are mapped to one or more field identifiers in the user profile. (Kikinis, col. 3, lines 35-38; 66-67: "The tool according to an embodiment of the present invention allows a user to quickly link pre-stored information of the sort most usually required by forms to fields in forms, and to transfer such information to the form fields."; "The code executing matches field names in the form with tags to the prestored information about the user.")

Regarding **independent claim 9**, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, Kikinis teaches a bubble analogous to a pop-down list of suggestions (Kikinis, Fig. 2, block 210) and also teaches navigating through the bubble using a computer input device to select the one selected data value, and removing the pop-down list after the user has made the selection. (Kikinis, col. 4, lines 7-15: "In a preferred embodiment another Hot Key or key combination, or key and mouse button combination causes the control code executing to display

a bubble 210 having a selection list 212 of tags for prestored information. FIG. 2 shows how the

bubble 210 could look on the screen, after being activated by holding a key and clicking a mouse

button. The user can move a highlight bar 211 up and down, and select an item to be pasted into

the field where tip (208) is pointing.")

Regarding **dependent claim 10**, <u>Kikinis</u> does not teach providing an extendable corner

tab permitting the pop-down list to be resized by the user. However, notice s taken that such

extendable corner tabs were well known in the art prior to applicants' claimed invention, as was

the benefit of permitting the user to re-size the list as needed when suggested values exceeded

the size of the list as displayed by default. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the step recited.

Regarding **independent claim 11**, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated

herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> does not teach providing the user with an option to globally disable

future storage of field data values. However, <u>Light et al.</u> teach disabling storage of field data

values on a case-by-case basis. (<u>Light et al.</u>, col. 7, lines 11-15.) One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to adopt the teaching of <u>Light et al.</u> by the recognition that there may

have been times when users would be entering values that would only be used once, *i.e.,* that the

user would not want stored for future use. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have

recognized from the description in the cited portion of <u>Light et al.</u> of iterating through field by

field that it would have been desirable to allow the user to globally disable storage of data values

to avoid the irritation of having to repeatedly enter identical negative responses to the question of

whether data values should be stored. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to provide the user with an option to globally disable future storage of field data values.

Regarding **independent claim 12**, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, Kikinis does not teach providing the user with an option to disable storage of field data values on a field by field basis. However, Light et al. teach disabling storage of field data values on a field by field basis. (Light et al., col. 7, lines 11-15.) One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to adopt the teaching of Light et al. by the recognition that there may have been times when users would be entering values that would only be used once, i.e., that the user would not want stored for future use. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the user with an option to disable storage of field data values on a field by field basis.

Regarding **independent claim 13**, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, Kikinis does not teach detecting a password field and forcing a user to select whether the data value therein will be stored for later use. However, notice is taken that at the time of applicants' invention HTML 4.0 provided a form element attribute for specifying a password field so that password characters would be masked when typed into a form field and displayed. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the user may not have wanted to save a password in a place where it might accessible for use by other users. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the step recited.

Regarding **independent claim 14**, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> does not teach detecting a credit card number field and suppressing suggestions in response thereto. However, notice is taken that at the time of applicants' invention HTML 4.0 provided a form element attribute for specifying a password field so that password characters would be masked when typed into a form field and displayed, and that this masking equally could have been applied to credit card numbers. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the user would not have wanted to save a credit card number in a place where it might accessible for use by other users. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the step recited.

Regarding **independent claim 15**, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> does not teach comparing the field identifier of the selected field to previously stored field identifiers that reside on a web site different from the computer on which the form is displayed. However, <u>Light et al.</u> inherently teach such a step inasmuch as they disclose storing field identifiers from whatever web site the user happens to be visiting, and then comparing the field identifier of the selected field to the stored field identifiers. (<u>Light et al.</u>, col. 7, lines 11-19; col. 5, lines 61-65.) Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement such a step because comparing field identifiers from multiple websites would have increased the likelihood that a suggested value could be found. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the step recited.

Regarding **independent claim 21,** <u>Kikinis</u> discloses a computer system comprising a processing unit, a memory, a display unit, and an interface to a network inasmuch as such a system inherently would have been necessary for the web browser application disclosed by <u>Kikinis</u>. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 3, lines 50-52.)

Further, the rejection of claim 4 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **dependent claim 22,** it is inherent in <u>Kikinis</u>' disclosure of a bubble, discussed above regarding claim 3, that a keystroke or mouse click (*i.e.,* selecting a suggested data value from the pop-up box) would be detected and that the system would be inhibited from pasting a suggested value into the form field until after receiving the keystroke or mouse click.

Regarding **dependent claim 24,** that claim is rejected for the same reasons given above for the rejection of claim 6.

Regarding **dependent claim 26,** that claim is rejected for the same reasons given above for the rejection of claim 9.

Regarding **dependent claim 27,** that claim is rejected for the same reasons given above for the rejection of claim 12.

Regarding **dependent claim 28,** that claim is rejected for the same reasons given above for the rejection of claim 15.

Regarding **independent claim 31,** a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing the same steps recited in claim 3, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> inherently teaches a computer-readable medium inasmuch as <u>Kikinis</u> teaches a CPU capable of executing code. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 1, lines 59-67.)

Regarding **independent claim 33**, a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing the same steps recited in claim 6, the rejection of claim 6 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, Kikinis inherently teaches a computer-readable medium inasmuch as Kikinis teaches a CPU capable of executing code. (Kikinis, col. 1, lines 59-67.)

Regarding **dependent claim 34**, the rejection of claim 7 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **independent claim 36**, a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing the same steps recited in claim 9, the rejection of claim 9 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, Kikinis inherently teaches a computer-readable medium inasmuch as Kikinis teaches a CPU capable of executing code. (Kikinis, col. 1, lines 59-67.)

Regarding **dependent claim 37**, the rejection of claim 10 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **independent claim 38**, a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing the same steps recited in claim 11, the rejection of claim 11 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, Kikinis inherently teaches a computer-readable medium inasmuch as Kikinis teaches a CPU capable of executing code. (Kikinis, col. 1, lines 59-67.)

Regarding **independent claim 39**, a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing the same steps recited in claim 12, the rejection of claim 12 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> inherently teaches a computer-readable medium inasmuch as <u>Kikinis</u> teaches a CPU capable of executing code. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 1, lines 59-67.)

Regarding **independent claim 40**, a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing the same steps recited in claim 13, the rejection of claim 13 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> inherently teaches a computer-readable medium inasmuch as <u>Kikinis</u> teaches a CPU capable of executing code. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 1, lines 59-67.)

Regarding **independent claim 41**, a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing the same steps recited in claim 14, the rejection of claim 14 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> inherently teaches a computer-readable medium inasmuch as <u>Kikinis</u> teaches a CPU capable of executing code. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 1, lines 59-67.)

Regarding **independent claim 42**, a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing the same steps recited in claim 15, the rejection of claim 15 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> inherently teaches a computer-readable medium inasmuch as <u>Kikinis</u> teaches a CPU capable of executing code. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 1, lines 59-67.)

Regarding **independent claim 43**, the rejection of claim 31 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> does not teach do not teach inhibiting display of suggested data values for password fields unless the URL from which the form was generated matches a previously stored URL. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have

displayed suggested password values only when matching URLs could be found because one of

ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that passwords could have been different from

site to site.

Regarding **independent claim 44**, the rejection of claim 31 above is fully incorporated

herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> teaches the computer-executable instructions comprising a web browser

that displays web pages and provides web navigation functions. (<u>Kikinis</u>, col. 3, lines 50-52.)

Regarding **independent claim 46**, the rejection of claim 31 above is fully incorporated

herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> does not teach detecting a username field and then automatically copying

a password previously used in response to the username into a password field. However, such a

step would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because one of ordinary skill in

the art would have recognized that that usernames and passwords are generally associated with

each other.

Regarding **dependent claim 47**, the rejection of claim 43 above is fully incorporated

herein.

Regarding **dependent claim 50**, <u>Kikinis</u> does not teach detecting a username field and

then automatically copying a password previously used in response to the username into a

password field. However, such a step would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that that usernames and passwords

are generally associated with each other.

Regarding **dependent claim 51**, the rejection of claim 43 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **independent claim 52**, the rejection of claim 46 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **dependent claim 53**, the rejection of claim 43 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **independent claim 54**, the rejection of claim 46 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, the combination of <u>Kikinis</u> and <u>Light et al.</u> does not does not teach prompting the user to indicate whether a password field should be stored for a URL when no indication to store a password has been previously indicated. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have so prompted the user because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the user might not want the password automatically stored because the user might not have wanted to give others access to the password and also would have recognized that if the user had not previously stored the password the reason might be that the user had not yet had the opportunity to do so, and did in fact want the password stored.

5.   **Claims 5, 23, and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kikinis</u> in view of <u>Light et al.</u> and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,199,079 to <u>Gupta et al.</u>, issued March 6, 2001, filed March 20, 1998.

Regarding **independent claim 5**, the rejection of claim 3 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, Kikinis does not teach comparing the field identifier of the selected field to previously stored field identifiers having the same URL and, upon finding a match, displaying the suggested data values having the same URL. However, Gupta et al. teach a form's URL as a criterion for selecting form data (Gupta et al., col. 8, lines 26-27), which would have suggested the recited step to one of ordinary skill in the art because such a person would have recognized that field identifiers having the same URL were likely to represent the same fields on the same form. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have compared the field identifier of the selected field to previously stored field identifiers having the same URL and, upon finding a match, displayed the suggested data values having the same URL.

Regarding **dependent claim 23**, the rejection of claim 5 above is fully incorporated herein.

Regarding **independent claim 32**, the rejection of claim 31 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, the rejection of claim 5 above is fully incorporated herein.

6.   **Claims 8, 25 and 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Light et al. as applied to claims 7, 21, and 33, respectively, above, and further in view of applicants' specification.

Kikinis does not teach comparing the field identifier of the selected field to field identifiers in a statically created standard vCard schema. However, applicants disclose in the specification (page 2, line 21) that the standard vCard schema was known in the art prior to applicants' invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the benefit of being able to compare selected field identifiers to field identifiers in a schema conforming to an

established standard. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the step recited in claims 8 and 35 respectively.

7.   **Claims 16-17, 19-20, 48-49, and 55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,666,502 to Capps, issued September 9, 1997.

Regarding **independent claim 16**, Light et al. teach (1) displaying on the user's computer a first form comprising a first plurality of text fields each comprising a field identifier and a data entry region into which a data value can be written. (Light et al., col. 2, lines 53 – col. 3, line 17.)

Further, Light et al. teach (2) entering a data value into one of the first plurality of text fields and storing the entered data value into a database. (Light et al., col. 7, lines 11-19.) Light et al. do not disclose storing the entered data into a local storage area on the user's computer. However, Capps teaches storing suggested values on the user's computer inasmuch as Capps teaches a computer system (Capps, Fig. 1) that stores and uses a history list of suggested values (Capps, col. 10, lines 3-5), which would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art to store entered data on the user's local computer because such a step would have made data readily available without risking the potential inefficiencies of accessing data through a network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have entered a data value into one of the first plurality of text fields and storing the entered data value into a local storage area on the user's computer.

Further, Light et al. disclose (3) displaying a second form comprising a second plurality of text fields comprising field identifiers different from those in the first form inasmuch as Light

et al. teach that their invention is embodied in a web browser that visits a plurality of web pages

(Light et al., col. 2, lines 53-62).

Further, Light et al. teach (4) detecting whether one of the text fields in the second form

is correlated with one of the text fields on the first form despite having a different field identifier,

and retrieving a correspondingly previously stored data value in response thereto. (Light et al.,

col. 6, lines 61-67: "At block 590, the system queries whether the data filled in matches

information in the database. This is applicable if a different tag is used by the web page for

known data. For example, the tag 'Christian name' may be used in a foreign web page, for the

data tagged 'first name' in the database. The data entered by the user would still be 'John', or the

appropriate first name.")

Further, Light et al. do not teach suggesting the data value retrieved in step (4) to the user

as a possible value to be entered into the second form. However, Capps teach displaying values

from a history list to the user as possible values to be entered into the second form. (Capps, col.

13, lines 2-4.) One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that such a step would

have provided the benefit of allowing the user to determine whether a suggested value was

appropriate instead of inserting a matched value that might be wrong, or not offering the user any

value at all. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have

extended Light et al. to implement step (5).

Regarding **dependent claim 17**, as noted above regarding claim 16, Light et al. teach

generating a plurality of forms from a plurality of web sites.

Regarding **dependent claim 19**, Light et al. do not teach retrieving and displaying in a

list previously stored data values. However, Capps teaches such a step. (Capps, col. 13, lines 2-

4.) One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that such a step would have provided the benefit of allowing the user to determine whether a suggested value was appropriate instead of inserting a matched value that might be wrong, or not offering the user any value at all. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have extended Light et al. to implement the step recited in claim 19.

Regarding **dependent claim 20**, Light et al. teach inhibiting the release of the suggested data value until the user has manipulated a user input device. (Light et al., col. 6, lines 25-29: "At block 550, the user is queried whether it is acceptable to fill-in the data.")

Regarding **dependent claim 48**, Light et al. do not teach detecting a username field and then automatically copying a password previously used in response to the username into a password field. However, such a step would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that that usernames and passwords are generally associated with each other.

Regarding **dependent claim 49**, Light et al. do not teach do not teach inhibiting display of suggested data values for password fields unless the URL from which the form was generated matches a previously stored URL. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have displayed suggested password values only when matching URLs could be found because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that passwords could have been different from site to site.

Regarding **dependent claim 55**, Light et al. do not teach prompting the user to indicate whether a password field should be stored for a URL when no indication to store a password has been previously indicated. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to have so prompted the user because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized

that the user might not want the password automatically stored because the user might not have

wanted to give others access to the password and also would have recognized that if the user had

not previously stored the password the reason might be that the user had not yet had the

opportunity to do so, and did in fact want the password stored.

8.   **Claim 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Light et al.</u> in

view of <u>Capps</u> as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of applicants' specification.

Neither <u>Light et al.</u> nor <u>Capps</u> teach using Bayesian inference techniques. However, as

applicants admit beginning at line 21 on page 20 of their specification, Bayesian inference

techniques were well known in the art at the time of applicants' claimed invention. Moreover,

one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use Bayesian inference techniques

to determine whether two form fields were correlated because such techniques predict

probabilities; *i.e.,* if there was a high probability that two form fields matched, then one would

probably want to use a value from the first field in filling in the second. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have extended the combination of <u>Light et al.</u>

and <u>Capps</u> to use Bayesian inference techniques.

9.   **Claim 45** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kikinis</u> in view

of <u>Light et al.</u> and further in view of <u>Capps</u>.

The rejection of claim 31 above is fully incorporated herein.

Further, <u>Kikinis</u> does not disclose that the computer-executable instructions permit the

user to delete one of the previously stored suggested data values. However, <u>Capps</u> teaches

removing the least recently used item from a history list when the list has reached maximum

size. (Capps, col. 16, lines 13-15.) Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have

recognized that not only would it be beneficial to automatically remove items so that the list did

not grow too large, but also that sometimes when the list got too large users might want to delete

an item other than the least recently used. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to permit the user to delete one of the previously stored suggested data

values.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-28 and 31-55 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

U.S. Patent Number	Name	Issue Date	File Date	
5,911,141	Kelley et al.	6/8/99	11/7/95	
5,864,340	Bertram et al.	1/26/99	8/22/96	
5,640,577	Scharmer	6/17/97	n/a	
5,450,537	Hirai et al.	9/12/95	n/a	
5,367,619	Dipaolo et al.	11/22/94	n/a	
4,763,356	Day, Jr. et al.	8/9/98	n/a	

12.   Applicants' amendment, *i.e.,* changing the effective filing date of this application by

filing a declaration under 35 CFR 1.131, necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Charles A. Bieneman whose telephone number is 703-305-8045.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular

communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

CAB
July 11, 2003

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER